

APPENDIX B: PROJECT INITIATION

B.1 EXAMPLE OF A PMIS STATEMENT

Ozark National Scenic Riverways GMP

Project Identification - PMIS 97321	
Project Title: OZAR General Management Plan	Project Total Cost: \$650,000.00
Park/Unit: Ozark National Scenic Riverways	Region: Midwest
States: MO	Congressional District: MO08
Old Package Number:	Reference Number:
Project Type: Non-facility	Financial System Package Number: OZAR 097321
Contact Person: Noel Poe	Contact Phone: 573-323-4236, extension 225

Project Status - PMIS 97321	
Date Created: 02/09/03	Review Status: WASO-Reviewed on 02/18/2004
Date of Last Update: 12/27/06	Updated By: Larry Sandarciero (Ljsand)

Project Narratives - PMIS 97321
<p>Description</p> <p>The 1984 General Management Plan (GMP) for Ozark National Scenic Riverways is outdated and inadequate. The new GMP would be completed by Denver Service Center, Regional and park staff.</p>
<p>Justifications</p> <p>Ozark National Scenic Riverways (OZAR) was established as the nation's first federally protected National River in 1964. Congress used the experience gained from establishing OZAR for the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968 that established a process for protecting other rivers within the United States. The General Management Plan (GMP) was approved in 1984 with its accompanying Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI). The GMP was approved under the old format using data from the late 1970s and provides little direction to guide park management with today's</p>

issues. For example the GMP does not describe resource objectives, desired visitor experiences, potential boundary adjustments, visitor carrying capacity nor potential partnerships. The plan is so outdated it provides almost no direction for the Government Performance and Results Act Strategic Plan.

A lot of the direction and recommendations in this 23-year old GMP are no longer valid due to court cases and new legislation. Some of the recommendations are not consistent with current NPS policies or the park's purpose and significance. For example the recommendation that areas and roads will be open for Off-Road Vehicle (ORV) use is not consistent with the Federal Executive Orders addressing ORVs, nor with NPS policies and Title 36 Code of Federal Regulations. Page 29 states that the park's road system will enhance ORV use. There are also formal and informal fords across the river used by ORVs and four-wheel drive vehicles.

The lack of desired resource and visitor conditions for the Riverways have left the last three managers without clear direction on appropriate types of recreational activity and the level of use. Consequently we are in a situation where campsites have been indiscriminately developed. For example the GMP states there will be 63 campgrounds with approximately 729 individual campsites and 42 group campsites. By 1999, there were over 100 campgrounds and more than 60 group campsites divided into three categories -- multi-family campsites, cluster campsites, and group campsites. In addition, hunters are allowed to vehicle camp anyplace with a backcountry permit and visitors may also camp in undesignated sites on gravel bars.

The GMP was developed when the 1979 visitation was 279,400. In 2002, visitation was estimated at over 1.5 million. There has been a visitor carrying capacity study completed on the rivers for canoes and the number of canoes launched by the 23 concessionaires are limited. However the capacity study does not consider Jon Boats users or inner tube floaters, the latter significantly contributing to the major visitation increase. Recreational horseback riding is increasing exponentially and the U.S. Geological Service is documenting fecal coliform contamination in the Jacks Fork during summer weekends when a business hosts horseback rides in the area that involve between 2,000 and 3,000 horseback riders. It has been ten years since the horsepower limitation on jet outboard motors were established. The GMP needs to consider if these regulations need to be modified in light of today's engines, the advent of 4-cycle outboard engines, and public desires.

Measurable Results

Provide long term direction and vision for the management of a national scenic river, which includes conservation, and preservation of natural and cultural resources, visitor enjoyment and visitor use management. This vision would be developed with public involvement and input, thus providing an opportunity for the communities, state agencies and other stakeholders and partners to support the final product. The outcomes of the implementation of a revised General Management Plan would be consistent management direction even as the superintendents transfer, satisfied visitors, and the restoration and management of the park landscape.

Project Activities, Assets, Emphasis Areas and GPRA Goals - PMIS 97321	
<p>Activities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capital Improvement • Manage Hazard/Pest • Planning • Restoration • Treatment • Provide Visitor Services/Activities 	<p>Assets</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Animal Population/Assemblage • Cave and Karst Feature • Riparian Area and Wetland • Freshwater Aquatic Ecosystem • Natural Sound/Quiet • Night Sky • River or Stream • Water Resource, general or not listed • Archeological Resource • Building • Campground • Cultural Landscape • Ethnographic Resource • Housing • Interpretive Program • Maintained Landscape • Viewshed
<p>Emphasis Areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Energy Conservation • Sustainability 	<p>GPRA Goals and Percent Values</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IVa0, 5% • Other plant species controlled, 10% • Other T&E species, 5% • Water Quantity: Protect and/or restore, 20% • Targeted acres restored , 20% • Visitor satisfaction, 15% • Visitor Understanding , 15% • Museum objects cataloged, 5% • Land Health Upland, 5%
Project Prioritization Information - PMIS 97321	
Unit Priority: 6 IN FY 2007	Unit Priority Band: HIGH
Project Assistance Needs - PMIS 97321	
<p>Is Assistance Needed: Yes [From Region] Project Assistance Needed in the Following Areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Management/Coordination 	

Project Funding Component - PMIS 97321A					
Funding Component Title: Revise OZAR General Management Plan			Funding Component Request Amount: \$650,000.00		
Funding Component Reference Number (Multi-purpose):			Funding Component Type: Non-recurring, Not Deferred		
Funding Component Description:					
Initial Planned FY: 2003			Requested Funding FY: 2004		
Review Status: WASO-reviewed on 02/15/2004			Funded Amount: Not Entered		
Date of Park Submission: 02/17/2003			Submitted By:		
Upper-level Review Status:			Fee-demo Submission Number:		
Formulated FY: 2004			Funded FY: 2005		
Formulated Program: Other Program			Funded PWE Accounts:		
Formulated Funding Source: General Management Plan			Funded Funding Source: General Management Plan		
Component Cost Estimates					
Estimated By: Ozar Superintendent			Date of Estimate: 02/09/2003		
Estimate in 2003 dollars			Class of Estimate: C		
Item	Description	Qty	Unit	Unit Cost	Item Cost
Revise General Management Plan	Revise GMP to provide for long term management direction under the existing guidelines and regulations.	1	Each	\$650,000	\$650,000
Component Funding Request					\$650,000
Eligible Funding Sources and Funding Priorities					
Funding Source	Unit Priority at Formulation	Regional Priority	National Priority	Year Unit-Prioritized	
General Management Plan	16	5		2003	

General Management Plan CBA Data - PMIS 97321A	
Last GMP Approval Date:	Last GMP Amendment Date:
<p>Factor 1: Need for Fundamental Direction, or Change in Direction, for Management of the Park:</p> <p>Project proposals that demonstrate the importance of a GMP to provide fundamental management direction for a new park or park addition, or to fundamentally redirect management of an existing park, will have advantages over other projects.</p> <p>The current 23-year old GMP has not been revised since Regional Director Charles Odegaard approved it. The Draft EA and GMP were issued in December 1981, using data from the late 1970s. Even before the Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) was signed, park issues were changing and the FONSI addressed six major issues and nine minor issues that were added to the Final GMP. These major issues (trapping, wilderness, floodplains, horsepower of outboard motors, recreation uses, and campground management) were added with a one paragraph of discussion.</p> <p>There were no future resource or visitor experience conditions addressed in the 1984 GMP. This has left the last three park managers without a clear direction for the management of resources and recreational activity. Consequently each manager has taken the park organization, resource and visitor use management on a slightly different path. For example the GMP suggested there would be a maximum of 63 campgrounds with approximately 729 individual campsites and 42 group campsites. By 1999, there were over 100 campgrounds and more than 60 group campsites divided into three categories -- multi-family campsites, cluster campsites, and group campsites. In addition, hunters are permitted to vehicle camp anyplace with a backcountry permit and visitors may also camp in undesignated sites on gravel bars.</p> <p>The 1984 GMP could be interpreted to encourage this unregulated spread of camping. On page 63 the GMP's direction for managing camping says, Camping will be allowed and managed essentially as described in the Existing Conditions. When one reads the Existing Conditions on page 29 it says, "Primitive camping occurs along the many unimproved dirt roads that lead to the rivers. Many of these sites (and) gravel bar sites are also used by canoeists and boaters."</p> <p>Therefore, the park's direction in the past has been to accommodate increasing visitor use levels by allowing the visitors to start using new camping areas without an analysis of that impact on the resource. After the new area has been used for camping for a period of time, the park staff would come in establish individual sites with tables and grills, place vault toilets, and provide for trash collection. Thus a new campground was established along with new road(s) and impacts.</p> <p>Ozark National Scenic Riverways is one of the few parks that have legislation that mandates the interpretation of the resource. (First sentence of PL 88-492: "for the purpose of conserving and interpreting unique scenic and other natural values and objects of historic interest, including preservation of portions of the Current River and Jacks Fork River"[emphasis added]) However on page 64, the GMP uses only one paragraph with two sentences to set goals and direction for the interpretative program. The following paragraph of two additional sentences and the accompanying Table 5 discussed interpretive themes. In total, only three-fourths of a page in the GMP is dedicated to this legislative mandate.</p> <p>Defining desired future conditions for resource and visitor experiences would provide</p>	

direction so that park managers may be held accountable by the Regional Office, conservation groups or friends/partners of the Riverways. In addition it is paramount that the public involved with the Riverways provide input for these desired future conditions.

Factor 2: Specific Resource Management Issues: Project proposals that demonstrate the importance of a GMP to respond to a significant resource management problem or opportunity will have advantages over other projects.

Some direction provided by the GMP is no longer valid or consistent with NPS policies and regulations. One of the greatest resource impacts facing the park is the rampant, widespread use of All Terrain Vehicles (ATVs) and four-wheel drive vehicles. Besides establishing new roads, these machines use formal and informal fords to cross the Current and Jacks Fork Rivers. In the last couple of years, Rails have been added to the mix of vehicles using the park. (Rails are oversized dune buggies designed to run in water and over vegetation.) This indiscriminate motorized use causes increased erosion into the rivers, destroys vegetation, impacts the wildlife, and washes oil, grease and other contaminants off the vehicles into the rivers.

Off-Road Vehicles (ORVs), which include all the vehicles described above, are prohibited in national park areas by Executive Orders and NPS policy unless they are permitted by special regulations and only if that use is consistent with the purposes for which the park unit was established. There have been no special regulations drafted to allow ORVs, nor is there any mention of ORV use in legislation or the legislative intent.

However on page 29, the 1984 GMP seems to encourage the use of ORVs on the park's road system with the statement: Hunting and ORV use are also enhanced by and occur frequently along the Riverways' network of roads. Page 63 states the future direction of ORV management is: "Areas and roads opened to ORV use will be specified in the road and trail study." This guidance is in direct violation of Executive Orders, NPS policy, and Title 36 regulations. There are numerous miles of roads and trails open to vehicles within the Riverways boundary. The 1991 Roads and Trail Survey stated that there are approximately 318 miles of roads and traces (a two-track vehicle trail) open to vehicles within the park boundary. In 2002 the park started identifying all roads and traces that are used by vehicles on a Geographical Information System (GIS) data layer. This effort should be completed in 2003. While the total is not yet available, indications are that there is fifty percent (50%) more miles of vehicle roads. If so, that would be nearly 500 miles of roads open to vehicles within the 80,000 acres of park.

These roads develop by ATVs using hiking or game trails. When vegetation gets beat down sufficiently, four-wheel drive vehicles can then use the route. The four-wheel drive use continues until a new trace is developed, which leads to more traffic. All of which seems to be encouraged by the 1984 GMP on pages 29 and 63.

Some direction provided in the GMP is contradictory, even in the same paragraph. For example, a state agency proposes to stock a non-native fish species, Rainbow Trout, in the Current River. The manager looking to the GMP for direction finds on page 46 that the park "will perpetuate native animal life and natural ecosystems where recreational fishing programs are authorized by law." However the proceeding sentences says, "these two agencies have also mutually agreed to jointly evaluate fish and wildlife resources and to initiate and carry out approved management programs, such as the restocking and introduction of game fish and wildlife species." (Emphasis added.) NPS policies are clear on introducing non-native species into a park area, but the GMP is in

conflict with agency policies. While it is clear which takes precedence, this conflict leads to confusion and questions when talking to partners and other shareholders.

A new GMP is needed to provide long term direction consistent with legislation and NPS policies that addresses such issues as mentioned above and mentioned in the other factors. A revised GMP would also provide direction to address the increasing recreational use impacts on the natural and cultural resources.

Factor 3: Specific Visitor Use Issues Project proposals that demonstrate the importance of a GMP to address a significant visitor use management or visitor experience problem or opportunity will have advantages over other projects.

Besides the examples given above there are other specific park issues that are ignored in the GMP or developed after the 1984 approval. One for example is the development of large, organized equestrian centers immediately outside the park. These two centers cater to large horse rides that occur multiple times per visitor season. The facility on the Jacks Fork River averages 2500 riders for a week during each of the eight special events. The facility on the north end of the park limits each event to 150 horses but offers 13 events during the season. It is not surprising that the only direction in the GMP is a statement on page 63 that horseback riding will be allowed on designated trails within the park.

These riders come into the park and ride the trail. U.S. Geological Survey research found that the fecal coliform counts in the Jacks Fork River during these large trail rides exceed the human body contact standard that is defined by Missouri Public Health and Environmental Protection Agency. It is suspected that the fecal coliform is coming from horse manure and is an indicator that there may be harmful pathogens in the water that park visitors are swimming, tubing and canoeing in. USGS research in 2003 hopefully will pinpoint the source of pollution.

The GMP did not address whether there are any boundary adjustments necessary to meet the objectives of the park's establishing legislation. It does provide some guidance on the management of conservation easements on private property within the boundary but because there are no desired future resource or visitor experience objectives it is difficult to determine whether private landowners desires comply with the scenic easement and the park's objectives.

The GMP does not encourage the use of partnerships or other alliances to protect not just the resources within the park but the conservation of resources on adjacent lands. The Riverways is well positioned to initiate some Cooperative Conservation Initiatives with its neighbors and state and local governments. While it is not essential to have this direction in order to initiate such discussions and actions, it would be extremely useful to have some broad conceptual guidance to help negotiate this issue.

It is realized that a new, revised GMP would not provide specific direction for every operational issue. However having a recent document that discusses and provides conceptual direction would help in seeking funds, donations, grants and partnerships to better conserve and interpret the park resources.

Factor 4. Specific Park Operations Issues: Project proposals that demonstrate the importance of a GMP to deal with a significant park operations problem or opportunity will have advantages over other projects.

There are multiple visitor use activities that are impacting the resources and are probably not consistent with desired visitor experiences. Some of these activities have

been discussed in the other factors. In addition there are missed opportunities to interpret the value of the park resources and importance of the park to surrounding communities. Also refer to Factor 1 on interpretation and Factor 5 on outdoor education opportunities.

The 1984 GMP was based on the 1981 Draft EA and GMP. Visitation data for the draft GMP came from 1979. In 1979 the park's visitation was 279,400. In 2002 the visitation was over 1.5 million. The number of canoes and tubes launched by the 23 concessionaires are regulated by contract but the number of private canoes, tubes, and Jonboats are not regulated. In addition there are no restrictions on the recreational use along the riverbanks that use vehicles for access. Park Rangers state that in the Upper Current River there are very few places where a canoeist can't either hear or see a vehicle driving along the river bank. Current park management questions whether this is the desired visitor experience.

Places like the "Flying W" and the land between Cedar Grove and Akers have unregulated visitor use. This also occurs in other areas of the park particularly from Waymeyer to the Van Buren Gap. In these reaches of the Riverways, the typical visitor experience is one of drunkenness, lewd behaviors, nudity, alcohol or drug abuse, and loud parties. The park rangers issue over 500 citations per year but without a Petty Offense Court Document procedure and lack of adequate law enforcement staff, these behaviors are difficult to change. It is common knowledge in the surrounding communities for people to not take their families and friends to the National Scenic Riverways on summer weekends, particularly to the hot spots identified above.

While a revised GMP would not address all visitor use activities and particularly visitor behaviors, it would establish desired visitor experiences. This action would provide direction for park management. It would then be up to the managers to establish or enforce regulations to meet the desired future conditions.

Factor 5: Other Advantages to the National Park Service:

Project proposals that can demonstrate other benefits of a GMP to the National Park Service as a whole may have advantages over other projects.

The attitude of a lot of the people living in the Ozark Mountains in southern Missouri and northern Arkansas is one of independence, integrity and distrust of government, particularly the federal government. There is little support for parks and the conservation of natural and cultural resources. A lot of people look to the parks and other protected land as only places to party, hunt and fish. These attitudes could be changed through a long-range, well-defined outdoor conservation educational program that focused on collaborative conservation efforts. Not only does this comply with Director Norton's CCI but it makes sense for instilling long-term conservation values into the school-age children of the Ozark Highlands, St. Louis, and Kansas City.

The park acquired the Welch Lodge in 1967, a former private fishing lodge on the east bank of the Current River. Initially the facility was used for the residential Youth Conservation Corp (YCC) program until the mid- 1980s. Since then the park has been doing minimal maintenance to preserve the buildings but has no long-range plans for use of the facility. The Welch Lodge was nominated as one of the Learning Centers under the Natural Resource Challenge Initiative along with the Gaddy House at Buffalo National Scenic River. This combined effort has not been funded and is unlikely to occur under the Learning Center Program.

The 1984 GMP was silent on the Welch Lodge. Since then a lot of park staff discussion

has centered on using the Lodge for a youth camp or outdoor education field study center. However it is difficult to muster any interest from outside entities when there is no basic direction offered by any major park planning documents. If the GMP planners would address the Welch Lodge and conceptually offer ideas for an educational facility, this board direction would start the process and be beneficial to the National Park Service and resource conservation in general.

	409 Funds	Other NPS Funds	Total (calculated)
FY1	\$50,000	\$0	\$50,000
FY2	\$200,000	\$0	\$200,000
FY3	\$200,000	\$0	\$200,000
FY4	\$100,000	\$0	\$100,000
FY5	\$100,000	\$0	\$100,000
Total			\$650,000

Additional Comments:

A lot of planning has been completed by the park staff or is in progress. For example: Long Range Strategic Plan, Business Plan, The Roads and Trail Study, Draft Campground Management Plan, Land Protection Plan, Resource Management Plan (old format), Fire Management Plan, Visitor Carrying Capacity (needs updated), Comprehensive Interpretative Plan, preliminary Cultural Landscape investigations, and Phase 1 of the Ethnographic Resources Identification. The park has a 3-ring binder will all of the legislation, congressional reports and other documents the determine legislative intent.

B.2 EXAMPLES OF PROJECT AGREEMENT SECTIONS

B.2.a Introduction

Excerpt from the Project Agreement for the National Mall

This project agreement (PA) sets out a common vision of how the planning team will complete a comprehensive management plan and related products; it includes the team and processes needed to achieve the plan and related products. Scope, budget, and schedule are also set forth in this agreement. Every project must balance schedule, budget, and scope and quality. A change in any one of these areas affects the others and therefore may require an amendment to this agreement.

Commensurate with the need for this plan is the commitment to providing quality documents. Planning products must be accurate, clear, and succinct, ensuring better understanding by the general public and a more effective document that can gain approval by management.

B.2.b Project Management Section

Excerpt from the Project Agreement for the National Mall

Scope Change Control. Often public scoping reveals levels of controversy or new issues that require a project scope correction. Changes in scope include additions or deletions of primary products, expansion of public involvement to include additional newsletters, and additional public meetings, etc. Scope creep typically adds to what was originally scoped for a project. After project scoping has been completed and on a semiannual basis, the scope of the project will be reexamined to determine if the Project Agreement needs to be revised. Reexamination will occur in conjunction with NCR-DSC work sessions.

Schedule Control. Complex projects with many different players are likely to run into justifiable schedule delays. It is often hard to schedule meetings when most team members can participate. Cumulative small project delays result in changed schedules affecting team member's ability to balance the demands of this complex project along with other work. Unforeseen events and critical staff turnover can also adversely affect a project schedule. Unrealistic or unmet review times constitute the major culprit resulting in scheduling delays. The importance of consolidated review comments cannot be stressed too heavily. Roundtable reviews will be used periodically to ensure more efficient use of review time. Differing numbers of reviews depending on types of product will facilitate keeping the project on track. The schedule will be updated for semiannual work sessions, and changes affecting major milestones, such as publication date goals, will require a project agreement amendment.

Cost Control. Costs are difficult to estimate until public scoping is completed. After public and internal scoping has been completed, the cost estimates for the project will be reexamined to determine if the project agreement needs to be revised. The cost estimate will be updated for semiannual work sessions, and changes affecting funding requests will require a project agreement amendment.

Quality Control. Quality control begins with the planning proposal and this project agreement. Initial concept reviews for each product will be used to evaluate whether the project is on track and at an appropriate level of quality. Project feedback to the Project Executive from those in key positions will occur in conjunction for preparation of semiannual work sessions. Quality course corrections will be made. If quality corrections affect scope, schedule, or cost, the project agreement will be updated.

B.2.c Communication Procedures Section

Excerpt from the Project Agreement for the National Mall

Clear, open, and trust-based communication among team members is essential on such a complex and politically sensitive project. High volumes of communication are expected. All communication must go through the Project Executive (PE).

Administrative Record. The PE will coordinate the project administrative record with NAMA Administrative Staff. In order to keep the administrative record complete and accurate, all communication should go through or copy the PE. Email is the preferred method of communication for general communication. The PE will periodically review organization of topic files and the administrative record to be kept in the park. The signed project agreement will be transmitted via paper copies, amendments will be updated via email. PEPC will be used as the basis for the administrative record and for many document reviews.

The PE will coordinate FOIA requests, cost estimates and any FOIA materials requested of NAMA or DSC through the NCR Chief Communications Officer and or the DSC FOIA officer.

Document mailing. Electronic versions will be sent to the PE and others via email, PEPC or ftp site; paper versions will be sent overnight to the PE and NCR Chief of Planning and Compliance for their distribution at the addresses listed on the attached team list. Technical materials will be sent directly to the relevant party with notification to the PE. U.S. Mail will not be used for documents sent to NCR and NAMA since documents may be damaged during mail screening.

FTP sites. It is expected that large files containing graphic materials or maps will need to be shared. A directory for the project will be established on both the internal NPS and external FTP sites. The external site will be used with consultants and information provided by other agencies.

E-mail. Subject lines should reference the CMP or PMIS # and specific topic. Draft documents, review comments, and important communications should use a high delivery priority. Because some e-mail files are expected to be extremely large, it is helpful to delete large files before responding back to the sender if changes to the file have not occurred.

FAX transfer. Fax will generally be used only when a memo or document cannot be electronically transferred. Fax numbers are listed on the accompanying team list.

PEPC. PEPC will be used throughout the planning as much as possible to facilitate record-keeping. PEPC will be used for posting internal draft review documents as well as receiving and documenting consolidated comments. The NAMA-PEPC administrator and PE will periodically review PEPC and notify staff of relevant items.

Team Involvement and Meetings. Team members may be working on different planning tasks related to the CMP. Task-related groups will prepare specific products and will correspond via email and telephone. Pertinent facts, data, or decisions should be recorded by email. Kick-off meetings will be held on-site so that team members can develop effective working relationships. To ensure the entire project team has a complete overview of project progress, semiannual team meetings and video or teleconferences will be scheduled in conjunction with regional work sessions. Team members may also be asked to participate in public and civic engagement.

Document tracking. It is expected that numerous concepts and drafts (text, sections, chapters, and studies) and will be produced by the core team. In order to track draft document history it is recommended that the date prepared be typed into the title line not in the header. Documents at all stages should have a header and footer. The header should include title of the section or document, draft # or final, and product titles. The footer should include the author's name, page of page #s, date (which will automatically update each time it is opened), and optional time of day (may be useful at times) as well as PMIS # and additional information related to specific product. Please update file extensions with revisions, initials of reviser, and revision date (Example: document name rev ss.4-18-05). A sample will accompany this project agreement.

